

118. h. 5.
2

R E M A R K S

ON THE

SCRIPTURAL ACCOUNT

OF THE DIMENSIONS OF

SOLOMON'S TEMPLE:

OCCASIONED BY THE

SUPPLEMENT

TO A PAMPHLET ENTITLED

EVIDENCE THAT THE RELATION OF JOSEPHUS

CONCERNING

HEROD'S HAVING NEW BUILT THE TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM

IS EITHER FALSE OR MISINTERPRETED.

BY THE AUTHOR OF
REMARKS ON THE EVIDENCE.

Quis ferat Josepho scriptori eximio inclementer dicere, quod scripserit Templum
Herode solo æquatum, et magnificentius pristino exstructum et instauratum?
SCALIGER de Emend. Temp.

Παν ὅτι ἀν' μελλης λαγειν, προταρον επισημοει τη γνημη· πολλοις γαρ ἡ γλωττα προ-
τριχῃ της διανοιας. Continuation of the Evidence, p. 66.

O X F O R D;

SOLD BY D. PRINCE AND J. COOKE; AND J. FLETCHER:

ALSO BY RIVINGTON, ELMSLY, PAYNE,

AND WHITE, LONDON.

MDCCXC.

R E M A R K S

SECRET

• 1910 FEB 11

REMARKS ON THE EVIDENCE
BY THE ATTORNEY OF



R E M A R K S
ON
JOSEPHUS'S ACCOUNT
OF
HEROD'S REBUILDING
OF THE
TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM.



XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

R E M A I N S

ON

JOSEPHUS'S ACCOUNT

OF

HEROD'S REBUILDING

OF THE

TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(vi)
TO THE

HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND

THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

MY LORD,

THE public are too well acquainted with your regard for ancient Learning, and for the advancement of Sacred Criticism, not to anticipate any reasons which I might offer for publishing under the patronage of your Lordship's name an humble attempt to illustrate a much disputed point in Sacred Antiquities. Waving therefore every thing, which a knowledge of your public character could suggest, and the most grateful sense of personal respect could dictate, I shall content myself with accounting to your Lordship for the publication of the following Remarks. They were occasioned by a Pamphlet lately published, entitled, "*Evidence that the Relation of Josephus concerning Herod's having new built the Temple at Jerusalem is either false or misinterpreted.*" Whichever conclusion be admitted, Josephus's character

character is at stake. If the latter, he becomes charged with a confused, negligent narrative; rendered purposely ambiguous, from a dishonest intention of imposing on his readers. If the former, the imputed falshood will tend to weaken the credibility of his Testimony in general, which every Christian, who inquires into the grounds of that belief, which he professes, must consider as interwoven with the fundamental reasons of his faith. A full and just examination of the Historical Character of Josephus, which demands the amplest resources of sacred and profane philology, I do not pretend to undertake: but as it seemed to require little either of sagacity or learning to remove the imputations above mentioned, I was induced to pursue the whole of the Inquiry as far as it is exhibited in the "Evidence," and through the following Remarks submit the result to the judgment of your Lordship and the public.

I have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's dutiful and obliged
Servant and Chaplain,

T, BURGESS.

OXFORD, *March*, 1788.

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHILE the former Remarks on the Evidence were in the Press, a second Edition of the Evidence, was published with a Supplement on the dimensions of Solomon's Temple. The Author has since published a Continuation of his Evidence, in which he renews his general objections to the demolition of the ναός, and therefore to the common interpretation of Josephus's account of Herod's Temple: he has added some remarks on the language of Josephus's narrative; and has varied a little the ground of his Hypothesis; but has made no addition to the doctrine of the Supplement. What I have to remark on the new Evidence in the Continuation, I reserve for another occasion: and confine myself, for the present, to the subject of the Supplement, that is,
to

ADVERTISEMENT.

to a point essential to the determination of the Inquiry: the Hypothesis of the Evidence depending on the supposition, that the vaos of Solomon's Temple was an hundred Cubits long in the clear, that is, forty Cubits longer than Zerubbabel's.



R E M A R K S
O N T H E
S C R I P T U R A L A C C O U N T
O F T H E D I M E N S I O N S O F
T H A T P A R T O F S O L O M O N ' S T E M P L E
C A L L E D
T H E N A O S .

THE Inquiry into Herod's Temple at Jerusalem, which concerns the veracity of a holy Prophet on one hand, and the credibility of a grave Historian on the other, involves three principal questions: Whether Josephus in his account of Herod's having rebuilt the Temple at Jerusalem, as it is commonly understood, has been misinterpreted or not: if not, whether the account be a mere fiction of the Historian, or a real fact: and if a fact, whether it be inconsistent with the prophecy of Haggai. The two last considerations, it is obvious, must be regulated by the event of the first.

B

The

The point still at issue between the *Evidence* and the *Remarks* is, Whether Josephus has been misinterpreted or not. If Zerubbabel's Temple was not inferior in length to Solomon's, the building erected by Herod could not have been any addition to the length of Zerubbabel's to make it equal to Solomon's; but must have been an entire new Temple. It is incumbent therefore on those, who think, that Herod did not take down and rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem, but only repair it, by adding to its length and height, to shew, that Solomon's Temple was *longer* than Zerubbabel's. The Author of the *Evidence* maintains that Solomon's Temple, that is, the *vaos*, was at least, one *hundred* cubits in the clear, which is *forty* cubits longer than Zerubbabel's. It is this supposed difference in the length of the two *vaos*, which has occasioned the Hypotheses, that there were *forty cubits of the foundation of Solomon's Temple unbuilt on by Zerubbabel*:—and that *Josephus in his account of Herod's building means only that he removed those old foundations and built forty cubits, in length, of new building as a continuation of Zerubbabel's*. The former of these Hypotheses has been, I think, sufficiently disproved in the first Section of *Remarks* on the *Evidence*, by shewing that both the Temples were of *equal* length; and the latter, in the second Section, by shewing that the language in Josephus's account will

will not, on any just principles of grammar, admit of any other construction, than that of an entire *demolition* and *rebuilding* of the Temple; and therefore that Josephus has not been misinterpreted.

But the Author of the Evidence thinks his opinion of Josephus's being misinterpreted not at all affected by those Remarks; and that some of the first and most respectable literary characters in the kingdom concur with him. I shall present the reader with the Author's own words in an Advertisement prefixed to his *Continuation* of the Evidence. "The general idea
"of the Evidence, that Josephus hath been
"misinterpreted, having met with the appro-
"bation of some of the first and most respectable literary characters in the Kingdom, the
"Author has been thereby encouraged to enlarge his Enquiries, in hopes of being able
"to establish that idea *beyond the reach of any*
"*further Controversy*. If the Author does not
"affix his name to his publication, his apology
"must be that he doth not write for fame but
"truth, and that he disclaims all pretensions of
"*triumphing* over those great and very learned
"persons, by whom the Historian appears hitherto to have been so much misunderstood."

With all proper deference to the Author's learned friends, I have no doubt that he is mistaken not only in the *general idea* of the Evi-

dence, but in almost every particular allegation from fact or language. I shall not however attempt to prejudice my reader in favour of the former Remarks on the Evidence, by mentioning any *respectable concurrences* of opinion; nor will I now anticipate the decision of the subject *beyond the reach of any further Controversy*, or my *triumph* in the following examination of the *Supplement*, but submit my remarks on it to the candid consideration of the Author, his friends, and our common readers.

There are two methods of determining whether Josephus has been misinterpreted or not; one by appealing to the terms, in which the Historian has delivered his account: and the other by comparing the dimensions of Solomon's and Zerubbabel's Temples. I shall not resume the argument from Josephus's own language in favour of the common opinion of Herod's Temple, but return to a point, which the Author of the Evidence had neglected in his first edition, but which he thought of sufficient consequence in the Inquiry to deserve a large *Supplement* to the second Edition; I mean the comparative length of the two *NAOI* of Solomon, and Zerubbabel. I am persuaded that most unprejudiced readers will be satisfied with the proofs, which have been already given in the first section of the *Remarks on the Evidence*, that

that the two NAOI were of equal length. But as the Author of the Evidence has employed his large *Supplement* to prove the contrary, the reasons, which are there alleged, I shall pursue at large: and if I can satisfy my reader by copiousness of Evidence, I shall most willingly risk the imputation of pedantry * by minuteness of citation.

§. 2. The Observations of the Supplement fall under two principal positions.

1. That Solomon's Temple was 100 cubits long, at the least, in the clear; and

2. That the Holy of Holies made no part of the House of sixty cubits mentioned in 2 Chron. iii. and in 1 Kings vi.

In support of the *former* position it is stated, that the Porch was 20 cubits long, the Sanctuary 60, and the Holy of Holies 20. The Holy of Holies is expressly said in Scripture, and is acknowledged on all hands, to have been twenty cubits long: the Porch is likewise known on the same authority to have been twenty cubits; but that the Sanctuary was *sixty* cubits long, is an estimate peculiar to the Author of the Evidence.

The *latter* position, which forms the chief

* See *Continuation*, p. 45.

subject

subject of the Supplement, is deduced from the following circumstances :

1. A deficiency of five cubits in the commonly acknowledged measure of the Temple (or Sanctuary,) if the Oracle (or Holy of Holies) made any part of the House of sixty cubits.

2. The distinction of the Temple and Oracle in 1 Kings vi.

3. The separate description of the Temple 1 Kings vi. 2—15. and of the Oracle, ver. 16. and a comparison of the 14th and 21st verses of the same chapter.

4. Some peculiar circumstances attributed to the structure of the Oracle.

5. The difference of materials, with which the temple and Oracle were floored.

6. The difference of height in the Temple and the Oracle.

§. 3. The first object then of the Supplement is to shew, that the *vaos* of Solomon's Temple was one hundred cubits in length, in the clear.

The dimensions are stated in the following manner: (p. 93.) "It is *expressly* said (2 Chron. "iii.) that the length of the House, which is "afterwards called the greater House, to distinguish it from the most Holy House, was
sixty

“ sixty cubits; the length of the Porch, twenty
 “ cubits, and twenty likewise the length of the
 “ most Holy House; so that the length of the
 “ whole evidently, according to *this account*,
 “ was one hundred cubits at least, ($20+60+20$
 “ $=100$.) But if this was the measure in the
 “ clear, as is most probable, then the length of
 “ the whole, from out to out, must have been
 “ more than an hundred cubits.”

The first impression, which this statement must excite is, that if *this account* be from Scripture, and if Scripture any where *expressly* assert that the Sanctuary was *sixty* Cubits long, whatever might have occasioned the prevailing and uniform opinion, that the Sanctuary was only *forty* cubits, to the *express* authority of Scripture, opinion must submit. —To prevent therefore any undue influence from this statement, I would, for the present, observe, that claims of *express authority* at the head of a doubtful argument, and in favour of a new hypothesis, are a sort of harmless sanguine expressions, which may be conceded to the fondness of an Hypothefist, but which do not always strictly correspond with their proofs.

In objection to the *general* statement of one hundred cubits length in the *clear*, perhaps it may be sufficient to reply, that the whole length of the *vaos* from *out to out* appears to have been
 but

but one hundred cubits; the *clear* dimensions therefore must have been much short of that extent.

	Cubits
1. The wall of the Porch was (Ezekiel xl. 48.)	5
2. The width of the Porch (1 Kings vi. 3.)	10
3. The wall of the Sanctuary (Ezek. xli. 5.)	6
4. The Sanctuary (1 Kings vi. 17. Ezek. xli. 2.)	40
5. The wall of separation — (Middoth)	1
6. The Holy of Holies — (1 Kings vi. 20. Ezek. xli. 4.)	20
7. The wall of the House — (Ezek. xli. 5.)	6
8. Chambers — (1 Kings vi. 6.)	7
9. The wall of the Chambers (Ezek. xli. 9.) *	5
	100

To the *particular* statement, that the Porch was twenty cubits long, the Sanctuary sixty, and the Holy of Holies twenty, there are three material objections:

1. That it is not the length, but the *width* of the Porch, which should be included in the length of the whole building:

2. That the Porch ought not to be included

* We have the authority of the Historical Books of Scripture for only the *clear* dimensions of the House. Where they fail in particulars, as in the *solid* dimensions, the description of Ezekiel has been taken; and, for want of Scripture authority, in one instance, the rabbinical account in the Middoth.—The highest chambers were *seven* cubits broad, and the lowest, five cubits: the space beyond the five cubits of the ground chambers, (proportionate, as it should seem, to the two cubits, by which the highest exceeded the lowest,) was occupied by stairs, which led to the upper chambers. 1 Kings vi. 8.—The *forty* cubits of the Sanctuary, which I assume here (instead of sixty) on the authority of the book of Kings and Ezekiel, will be confirmed at large in the fourth Section.

at

at all in the *clear* dimensions of the *House of God*, or *vaos*: and

3. That the Sanctuary instead of being sixty was only forty cubits long.

As to the *first* objection, it is said, 1 Kings vi. 3. that "the *length* of the *Porch* was according to the *width* of the *House*." But why according to the *width* of the *House*? because the *length* of the *Porch* was not only of the same number of cubits, but in the same direction with the *width* of the *House*. Therefore the *width* of the *Porch* must have been in the same direction with the *length* of the *House*; as will appear from the slightest inspection of any ichnography of the *vaos*.* Consequently as

* In a note to the "Remarks on the Evidence" p. 18. I endeavoured to account for some mistakes respecting the dimensions of the two Temples, of Solomon and Zerubbabel, "by supposing them to have arisen from comparing estimates, which are not correlative. One estimate asserts that Solomon's temple was sixty cubits long, which respects the interior space only. Another that the Temple was seventy cubits long, which includes the Porch, which was ten cubits long. A third says, that the Temple was an hundred cubits long, which includes the *vaos*, the Porch, the Chambers, and the whole space from out to out. Therefore it may be said in different places, and with different views, that Solomon's Temple was an hundred cubits in length, and Zerubbabel's sixty, and that Zerubbabel's was an hundred and Solomon's sixty without supposing any difference in their relative dimensions."—Of this passage the Author of the Evidence observes in his *Continuation*, p. 25. that "Mr. B. says the Porch was only ten cubits in length; but the Scriptures and Josephus say otherwise."—It required no great attention to the different directions of the *House* and the *Porch* to have seen, that by the ten cubits of the *Porch* was meant the ten cubits in the direction of the *length* of the building: as the twenty cubits of its own length could not come into the length of the *House*. If the Author of the

the width of the Porch was only ten cubits, the whole length of the building, in the clear, even including the *Porch*, and admitting *sixty* cubits to have been the length of the Sanctuary, will amount only to *ninety* cubits, instead of an hundred, ($10+60+20=90$.)

In the *second* place the Porch ought not to have been included at all in the *clear* dimensions of the House. It is not considered in the historical accounts in Scripture as a part of *the House of God*. The term *House of God*, which was applied both to the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, (the latter of which was called the *inner House*, and the former, the *House before the Oracle*, and the *greater House*,) is not anywhere so applied to the Porch. The Porch, though in Ezekiel it is called the Porch of the House, το αἶλαμ του οἴκου, האלם הבית, is not called το αἶλαμ του ναου, האלם ההיכל: and in the historical books it is called the Porch “*before the Temple of the “House,”* and “*in the front of the House.*” Josephus calls the Porch προναον, (Antiq. viii. 3. &c.) The omis-

Evidence will apply the distinctions before mentioned to p. 21. and 22. of the *Continuation* he will find no difficulty in Josephus's saying that the ναος destroyed by Titus was sixty cubits long, and yet that the same ναος built by Herod was an hundred cubits: and (p. 32.) will see why Zerubbabel's Temple, which was sixty cubits in the clear exclusive of its Porch, or Walls, or Chambers, could not have left the void space there supposed.

tion

sion of the Porch * will reduce the estimate to eighty cubits, ($60+20=80$.)

The *third* objection will, if I mistake not, reduce it to *sixty* cubits, which is the length attributed to *the House of God* built by Solomon, in 1 Kings vi. 2. 2 Chron. iii. 3. and to the same House, or *vaos*, in Josephus.

§. 4. The Supplement indeed asserts (p. 93.) that it is *expressly* said in 2 Chron. iii. that the greater House, or Sanctuary, alone, was sixty cubits in length. By an *express* account, the Author cannot mean, what is usually meant, an account, totidem verbis, that *the greater House was sixty cubits in length*; because in the verse, which speaks of the greater House, there is no account at all of its dimensions. Nor can it, I think, be collected by just implication from any reference to the verse, in which mention is made of the House of God, which was sixty cubits in length. The whole passage is as follows, 2 Chron. iii. 3. “ Now these are the things, “ wherein Solomon was instructed for the building of the House of God. The length by cubits after the first measure was *threescore cubits*, and the breadth, twenty cubits. 4. And

* A decisive proof that the *Porch* made no part of the *clear* dimensions of *the House of God*, or *vaos*, will result from evidence produced hereafter, that the whole interior space of the House in length was only sixty cubits, of which forty belonged to the Sanctuary and twenty to the Holy of Holies.

“ the Porch, that was in the front of the House,
 “ the length of it was according to the breadth
 “ of the House, twenty cubits, and the height
 “ was an hundred and twenty : and he overlaid
 “ it within with pure gold. 5. And the greater
 “ house he cieled with fir-tree, which he over-
 “ laid with fine gold, and set thereon palm-trees
 “ and chains. 6. And he garnished the House
 “ with precious stones for beauty : and the gold
 “ was gold of Parvaim. 7. He overlaid also
 “ the house, the beams, the posts, and the walls
 “ thereof, and the doors thereof with gold, and
 “ graved cherubims on the walls. 8. And he
 “ made the most Holy House, the length whereof
 “ was according to the breadth of the House,
 “ *twenty cubits*, and the breadth thereof twenty
 “ cubits : and he overlaid it with fine gold,
 “ amounting to six hundred talents.”

The general proposition in the first verse of
 the preceding passage is that *the House of God*
 should be sixty cubits in length. As only *one*
 House of God was proposed to be built, or was
 built, the *greater House* cannot mean the *whole*
 of this House of sixty cubits, but the greater
 portion of the House. The Sanctuary therefore,
 which was the greater portion, could not have
 been sixty cubits in length. Again, when it is
 said that *the House of God*, and *the House, which*
Solomon built for the Lord, was sixty cubits long,
 the expression is too general to mean less than
 the

the *whole* House of God, or *naos*. It is not probable that the appellation of *the House of God* should be used exclusively of any part of the House. But if it were possible, it is not probable, that it should be exclusive of the most sacred part of it, the part, which God deigned more especially to glorify by his visible presence. The instructions, which Solomon received for building *the House of God* are clearly limited to the House of *sixty cubits*, from which therefore the Holy of Holies could not have been excluded. But as the Holy of Holies was only *twenty cubits* long, it could have been only part of this House: and nothing but the Sanctuary could constitute the remainder. It appears therefore that both the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies were included in the House of God, which was *sixty cubits* long. If then the interior space of the whole House consisted of only *sixty cubits*, as the Holy of Holies is acknowledged on all hands to have been *twenty cubits* long, the Sanctuary could have been only *forty*.

It is true that the length of the Sanctuary thus collected is not *expressed* in the passage of Chronicles before quoted. But what must we infer from thence? nothing, I think, that can invalidate the deduction. In such details of buildings a complete enumeration of all particulars is not to be expected. The omissions, however, of one account are often made up by the particulars

culars of another. In the book of Kings, though it is mentioned that the floor of the House was covered with planks of fir, it is not said, with what materials the cieling was covered. The omission is supplied in the book of Chronicles. The height of the Porch, which is omitted in the book of Kings, is given in the book of Chronicles. The full dimensions of the House from out to out are omitted in the books of Kings and Chronicles, but may be collected in great measure from Ezekiel.

In the same manner, though the length of the Sanctuary is omitted in the book of Chronicles, the omission is supplied in 1 Kings vi. 17. a passage, which is, I believe, universally (except by the Author of the Evidence) understood to mean, that the Temple or Sanctuary was *forty* cubits long. Ver. 16. "And he built
 " twenty cubits on the sides of the House, both
 " the floor and the walls, with boards of cedar:
 " he even built them for it within, even for the
 " Oracle, even for the most holy place. 17. And
 " the House, that is, the Temple, before it,"
 (or, and the House before it, that is, the Temple) "was *forty* cubits long." It is not indeed expressed in the original nor in the Septuagint translation, whether the forty cubits were in length, breadth, or height: but in the English translation, and, I believe, all others where the ellipsis is supplied, it is translated *forty cubits*
long

long. And, as the passage stands, it could not have been translated otherwise: for as the dimensions of forty cubits could not belong to the breadth of the house, for that was twenty; nor to the height, for that was thirty; it could belong only to the length.

The account, which is given in 1 Kings vi. is as follows: ver. 2. "And the House, which
" King Solomon built for the Lord, the length
" thereof was THREESCORE cubits, and the
" breadth thereof twenty cubits, and the height
" thereof thirty cubits. 3. And the Porch before the Temple of the House, twenty cubits
" was the length thereof, according to the
" breadth of the House, and ten cubits was the
" breadth thereof before the House. 16. And
" he built twenty cubits on the sides of the
" House, both the floor and the walls with
" boards of cedar: he even built them for it
" within, even for the Oracle, even for the
" most Holy place. 17. And the house, that
" is, the Temple, before it, was FORTY cubits
" long. 20. And the Oracle [in the fore part,
these words are not acknowledged by the Septuagint, edd. Vat. Bos.] was TWENTY cubits in
" length, and twenty cubits in breadth, and
" twenty cubits in the height thereof." The account in the book of Chronicles has been quoted above, p. 11.

The relation of Josephus (*Antiq. viii. 3. §. 1.*

2, 3. 7.)

2. 3. 7.) may serve as a comment on the accounts in the historical books of Scripture. Της δ' οἰκοδομίας τοῦ ναοῦ Σολομὼν ᾤξαστο, τέταρτον ἐτος ἡδὴ τῆς βασιλείας ἔχων.—Τὸ μὲν αὖν ὕψος ἦν ἙΞΗΚΟΝΤΑ πηχῶν, τὰν δ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ ΜΗΚΟΣ, εὐρὸς δ' εἰκοσι. Κατὰ ταῦτου δὲ ἄλλος ἦν ἐγγεγέρμενος, ὡς τις μετροῖς ὥστε εἶναι τὸ πᾶν ὕψος τῷ ναῷ πηχῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ εἰκοσι. Τετραπλοῦ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολὴν. Τὸ δὲ πρὸναον αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἑστησάν ἐπὶ πηχεῖς εἰκοσι τὸ μῆκος, πρὸς τὸ εὐρὸς τοῦ οἴκου τετραγώνου, ἔχον δὲ πλάτες πηχεῖς δέκα, ὕψος δὲ ἀνεγγεγέρμενον πηχῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ εἰκοσι.—Διελὼν δὲ τὸν ναὸν εἰς δύο, τὸν μὲν ἐνδοθεν οἶκον, Εἰκοσι πηχῶν, ἐποίησεν ἀδύλον εἶναι· τὸν δὲ ΤΕΣΣΑΡΑΚΟΝΤΑ πηχῶν, ἁγίον ναὸν ἀπέδειξεν.—Ταῦτα πάντα εἶχεν ὁ τῶν ΤΕΣΣΑΡΑΚΟΝΤΑ πηχεῶν οἶκος, πρὸ τοῦ καταπέτασματος τοῦ ἀδύλου.

To these clear testimonies, to which I think every thing but a contrary hypothesis must readily accede, we may add a passage from Ezekiel, in which the *length* of the Temple or Sanctuary is expressly said to be *forty* cubits. Though there are many difficulties with respect to the dimensions of the whole *ἱερόν*, as represented by Ezekiel, yet the *clear* dimensions of the Sanctuary and of the Holy of Holies as well as the Porch, are the same with those before attributed to the account in the book of Kings. Ch. xl. 48. “ Then he brought me to the Porch of
“ the House, and he measured the pillars of
“ the PORCH, five cubits on this side, and five
“ cubits on that side: and the breadth of the
“ gate

" gate was three cubits on this side, and three
 " cubits on that side. The length of the Porch
 " was twenty cubits, and the breadth ten cu-
 " bits : " [*so ed. Ald. and Bp. Newcome.*] " and
 " they went up to it by ten steps : and there
 " were columns by the Porch, one on this side,
 " and another on that side. Ch. xli. 1. After-
 " ward he brought me to the TEMPLE ; and
 " he measured the pillars ; six cubits was the
 " breadth on this side, and six cubits was the
 " breadth on that side, which was the breadth
 " of the Tabernacle. And the breadth of the
 " door-way was ten cubits ; and the sides of
 " the door way were five cubits on this side,
 " and five cubits on that side : and he measured
 " *the length thereof forty cubits*, and the breadth
 " twenty cubits. Then he went INWARD
 " (*εις την αυλην την εσωτερικην* Sept.) and he measured
 " the pillars of the door, two cubits ; and the
 " door, six cubits ; and the breadth of the door-
 " way, seven cubits [on this side, and seven
 " cubits on that side.] And he measured the
 " length thereof twenty cubits, and the breadth
 " twenty cubits before [or, *within*] the Tem-
 " ple ; and he said unto me, This is THE MOST
 " HOLY PLACE. " Ezek. xl. and xli.*

* I have for most part followed the learned Bp. of Waterford's translation. I have however retained *before the Temple* instead of the new translation *according to the front of the Temple*, which seems to have been formed on the Septuagint, *κατα προσωπον του ναου* : though the words of the Septuagint do not, I think, mean either *before the Temple*, in the usual sense of those terms, which is contrary

To the passage in the book of Kings the Author of the Evidence has made his objections, and has suggested two expedients to remove from the passage it's incongruity with his opinion of

to the position of the most Holy place ; or according to the front of the Temple : for, it may be asked, why " according to the front " of the Temple, " rather than according to that part of it contiguous to the Holy of Holies, the contiguous part being also twenty cubits, as well as the front part. *Κατὰ προσώπου του ναου*, perhaps, in this place, if literally translated, should be *adversus faciem templi*, or *adversus templum*, but in English *correspondently with the Temple*, i. e. according to the measure of the Temple. The measure in breadth was the same both in the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies. As the meaning thus attributed to *κατὰ προσώπου* is unusual, it may require some explanation. The primary idea of equality and correspondence results from the apposition and contiguity of objects. It is from this circumstance that the Greek *ἂντι* derives its notion of equality. *Before or opposite* the Temple therefore, in such a language as the Hebrew, (which more than other languages must, from the paucity of its words, abound in complex terms, which unite physical and secondary meanings,) might signify *equally with or according to* the Temple ; and in a Greek translation might perhaps be literally rendered *κατὰ προσώπου τε ναυ*. The sense, which I impute to *κατὰ προσώπου τε ναυ* in this passage is favoured by two passages in 2 Chron. iii. " And the Porch, that was before the " front of the House, the length of it was according to the breadth " of the House, twenty cubits : " *μηκος ἐπὶ ΠΡΟΣΩΠION πλάτους του οίκου, ἡ ἕως τῶν ἱκανοῦν*. Again v. 8. " And he made the most holy place, " the length whereof was according to the breadth of the House, " twenty cubits, " *μηκος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ΠΡΟΣΩΠION πλάτους [vulg. πλάτος] του οίκου, ἡ ἕως τῶν ἱκανοῦν*. As *ἐπὶ προσώπου πλάτους* is equivalent to *ἐπὶ τοῦ πλάτους* 1 Kings vi. 3. ed. Complut. so *κατὰ προσώπου του ναου*, in the sense before suggested, is equivalent to *κατὰ τον ναον*.—The original is *אל-פני הדביר*, which perhaps would most properly be translated *within the Temple*, *ἐνδοθεν του ναου*. This sense is supported by v. 3. in which we have *ובא לפניו*, " he went inward." In 1 Kings vi. 20. *ולפני הדביר* should also be translated " And the " Oracle *within*."—The conclusion of the passage from Ezekiel, " And he said unto me, " This is the most holy place, " is omitted in Bp. Newcome's translation, perhaps, by an error of the Press, as no reason is given for the omission in the notes. The clause is authorized by the original and the Septuagint.

the

the length of the Sanctuary ; one by correcting the Hebrew text, and the other by correcting the English translation. The objections shall be considered after it has been seen, what advantages we derive from the corrections.

His correction of the text is to read **ורבעים היה הבית הוא באמה** which he translates *Et quadrata erat in cubito domus hæc*, instead of **ורארבעים באמה היה הבית הוא**, *Et quadraginta erat in cubito [or quadraginta cubitorum erat] domus illa*. He thinks that by this correction a satisfactory account might be given of the passage, and that it might be intelligibly rendered by the translation, which he gives. The Oracle, to which the correction limits the passage, was certainly *square*; and, perhaps, **רבע היה הבית** (not **רבעים**) would alone, without **באמה**, express, that *quadrata erat domus*; but the measure of the Oracle is specified in v. 20. and it does not seem probable, that it would be also introduced in v. 17. though in more general terms; at least it does not seem right to introduce such disorder by emendation. But, admitting that exactness of connection is not to be expected in these very ancient descriptions, the passage, as it is corrected, does not seem to afford the meaning, that is attributed to it. For though **ורבעים היה הבית** should be allowed to signify *the house was square*, yet by the addition of a particular *measure*, without any specification of *number*, in "qua-

“drata in cubito, רבעים באמה,” the term expressive of squareness becomes the adjunct or appellative of *that measure*, and not of the *house*, as before; therefore *quadrata erat in cubito* is the same as *quadratorum erat cubitorum*, the *house consisted of square cubits*, a sense too general to answer any purpose. The emendation seems further inadmissible in point of grammatical construction. There is a well known reason, why the common reading ארבעים, *quadraginta*, has the plural termination: it is the plural form, which extends the meaning of ארבע, *four*, from its primary meaning to *forty*. But there is no such reason, why רבע, which in its singular form means *quadratus*, should be used in the plural רבעים to express the same meaning, where the notion of *quadrature* belongs to *one* object, and not to *many*, that is, to the *whole space* of the Oracle, and not its *cubits*.

The correction of the English translation is proposed (p. 104. n.) for a different purpose, not in conformity with his correction of the Hebrew, to limit the passage to the Oracle, not to express, that the Oracle was *square*, but to remove the measure of *forty cubits* from the *length* of the Temple to the *front*. The words of his translation are, “*And forty cubits was this House (or building) of the Temple in front.*—
“The extent of the front, says the Author, is
“certainly *known* to have been thirty cubits, and
“in

“ in all *probability* extended, as the text expresses it [i.e. in the corrected translation] forty cubits ; and if so, the literal translation of the passage will be thus : *And forty cubits &c.*”

I lay no stress on the impropriety of such an inversion of terms, as *the House of the Temple*,* when applied to only a part of the *naos*, instead of *the Temple of the House* ; (1 Kings vi. 3.) the House, or the House of God, being the general term for the whole *naos*, of which the Temple and Oracle were parts : but pass to what appears to be an insurmountable difficulty, I mean the incongruity of the new Translation with the extent of the *naos* in front. We are left indeed to guess at what the Author means by the House's *extending forty cubits in front*, whether he means the Porch, and whether the interior space, or the space from out to out. The Porch cannot be admitted into the account ; as it made no part of the House of sixty cubits, to which alone the passage relates. The *interior* space, indeed, both of the House, and of the Porch before the House, is inapplicable : for that was but twenty cubits. If however to this space be added the interior space of the Chambers annexed to the House, which were five cubits

* Sir Isaac Newton in his *Chronology* (Vol. 5. of his works, p. 241.) where he gives a large account of Solomons Temple, uses the same terms, *the house of the Temple*, but he applies them not to a part of the building, but the whole. The passage will be quoted at the end of the next Section.

wide

wide on each side, there will then be *thirty* cubits for the interior space of the building. Lightfoot says, that the breadth of the *vaos*, the side chambers and all taken in, was not more than thirty cubits.* This is, perhaps, what the Author meant by the *known* extent of the Front. But this falls short, by ten cubits, of his sense of the passage. Still "it is *probable*, that it extended forty cubits." Against the probability of such extent, no one would contend, if there were good authority for it.—"It is so expressed in the text." This is the very point to be proved; no concurrent authority is produced; and it appears, I believe, only in our Author's translation. To justify, therefore, the new Translation, we have only the evidence of that translation.

But if the *interior* space be not commensurate with these *forty* cubits, perhaps the *exterior* space of the Front may be. The Porch must be excluded from the account for the same reason, as before: it made no part of *the House of sixty cubits* in question. Indeed the Author contends that even the Holy of Holies made no part of it; much less therefore the Porch. Besides the Porch from out to out was equal to the length of the whole building from out to out, being 100 cubits in extent. For the exterior space then of the front we must take the fore part of *the house*, next

* *Of the Temple* p. 1064, 1065.

to the Porch; which could not differ in width from the middle or the extremity. The expression therefore, which ascribes as peculiar to one part of its breadth, what belongs to all, would induce us to doubt the propriety of a conjectural translation, if there were no other objection. But the *vaos*, in the exterior dimensions of it's breadth, exceeded the forty cubits as much as the interior space fell short of it. To the *thirty* cubits before mentioned, if we add the extra space of *two* cubits on each side for the stairs; *six* cubits breadth on each side, for the walls of the House, *five* cubits on each side for the walls of the chambers, and *two* cubits on each side for the impluvium, and the partition between it and the Chambers, we have an extent of *sixty* cubits for the breadth of the building from out to out. See before, p. 8.

	Cubits
The Stairs, two Cubits on each side, ———	4
Wall of the Chambers, five Cubits on each side, ———	10
Chambers, five Cubits on each side, ———	10
Impluvium, two Cubits on each side, ———	4
Wall of the House, six Cubits on each side, ———	12
The House ——— ——— ———	20
	60

The width of the *Stairs* I collect from the surplus of the space by which the highest Chambers (of 7 cubits) exceeded the lowest, which were five cubits. The width of the *Impluvium* in this account is determined by the other dimensions. The whole breadth of the house being according to

to Josephus sixty cubits, as the Stairs, the Walls of the Chambers, the Chambers, the Walls of the House, and the House, contain together fifty six cubits, there will remain two cubits on each side for the Impluvium to complete the sixty cubits of breadth. The estimates, which give a greater extent to the width of the house, by giving larger dimensions to the stairs, the impluvium, and its partition or wall, are still more inconsistent with a front of *forty* cubits. That the *naos* of Solomon was only sixty cubits broad from out to out, we are led to conclude from the dimensions of the *naos* built by Zerubbabel and Herod, which were sixty cubits broad. Josephus in his account of the building of Solomon's Temple (Antiq. lib. viii. c. 3. §. 2.) does not state the dimensions in breadth from out to out; but in his account of the Temple, (which Herod built on the model of Solomon's,) when it was destroyed by Titus, he says *that* was *sixty* cubits broad. (de Bell. Jud. lib. v. c. 5. §. 4.) In the next Section of the same Chapter, he says that the breadth was *twenty* cubits, in the latter passage meaning the clear, in the former, from out to out. It seems probable too from the breadth of Zerubbabel's building, which was sixty cubits, (Ezra vi. 3.) that Solomon's was of the same breadth.* Ezekiel and

* Lightfoot (p. 1064.) considers the sixty cubits breadth of Zerubbabel's building as the interior space: for he says, that the breadth of Zerubbabel's Temple was double the breadth of Solomon's.

the Middoth extend the width of the building to seventy cubits. But whether the fore part of the building be considered as 20 or 30 cubits in breadth according to the interior space; or, as 60 or 70, from out to out; all the differences are incompatible with the new translation, which makes the Temple to be *forty* cubits in front.

But if these forty cubits are not applicable to the *front* of the Temple, they are not less inapplicable to the Oracle, by our Author's own acknowledgement. Yet he says (p. 99. n.) that instead of *καὶ τεσσαράκοντα πηχέων ἢ ὁ ναὸς κατὰ πρῶτον του Δαβὶρ*, in the Septuagint translation, to have been conformable to the Hebrew, it should have been *ἢ ὁ οἶκος κατὰ πρῶτον του ναου*. "and thus the forty cubits (if such be the meaning of the Hebrew) will appear evidently to have been spoken of the Oracle. "But in *no sense whatever* are forty cubits applicable to the Oracle: therefore it is most

Solomon's. There is however no apparent reason, why Zerubbabel's building should have been double the magnitude of Solomon's in breadth, when it was only equal to it in length, and inferior to it in the height of the Porch. It is as improbable, that it should have been double to Solomon's in height. But if we suppose these sixty cubits of breadth and height to be dimensions from out to out, it will remove all apparent inconsistencies, and by making the building not greater than Solomon's, but only equal to it, will render it's magnitude more suitable to the condition of the Jews. The supposition of the difference between the two buildings may, perhaps, be referred to the cause mentioned above p. 9. *note*. Bedford (in his Scripture Chronology p. 572.) instead of sixty cubits *breadth* proposes to translate *f. c. length*.

E

" probable

" probable, that such is *not the signification of the Hebrew.*"

In the correction of the English translation our Author ascribes the forty cubits to the front of the Temple, in conformity to the Hebrew text: in this correction of the Septuagint, they are attributed to the Oracle, in conformity to the same Hebrew text. This I do not understand. Again he says that to be *conformable to the Hebrew*, the language of the Septuagint should be as he has corrected it; yet he does not think it probable, that the meaning which his correction gives, is *the meaning of the Hebrew*. This I understand as little as the other. It must be a very oblique and illusive view of the *Naos*, that could induce any one to apply to the Oracle forty cubits *κατα προσωπον τῆ ναῦ*. If *κατα προσωπον τῆ ναῦ* be understood in its usual and proper sense, it is contrary to the *position* of the Oracle: for as the Porch, the *προναος*, was *πρὸ τῆ ναῦ* or *κατα προσωπον τῆ ναῦ*, so the *ναος* was *πρὸ τῆ δαῦρι*, or in the language of the Septuagint, *κατα προσωπον τῆ δαῦρι*; and the Oracle, *κατεπιν* or *ενδοτερον τῆ ναῦ*. If *κατα προσωπον τῆ ναῦ* be understood in the secondary sense referred to above p. 18. *note*, the forty cubits are inconsistent with the *dimensions* of the Oracle. And as the Author acknowledges that *forty cubits* are not in any sense whatever applicable to the Oracle and that the Hebrew most probably has not the meaning, which

which the correction annexes to the Septuagint, I do not perceive the propriety of correcting the Septuagint to make it assert, what is acknowledged to be founded neither in the original, nor in fact.

The Septuagint translation in the common reading is consistent with the usual opinion of the measures of the Sanctuary, as well as with the relative position of the two parts of the Naos, and with its original, as I shall endeavour to shew; and inconsistent only with the Hypothesis of the *Evidence*, and its *Supplement*. The Hebrew words הבית הוא ההיכל לפני are literally *the house itself, the temple before* — *domus ipsa, Templum in facie, or templum ante*, not *domus ipsa in facie Templi*, as the correction ὁ οἶκος αὐτος κατὰ προσώπον τοῦ ναοῦ supposes: that construction, I conceive would require a different arrangement of words, viz. לפני ההיכל *ante templum*. But even if this latter sense did not labour under the difficulties above mentioned, the author has produced no similar instance to shew that לפני ההיכל *templum in facie, the temple before*, can be used (with לפני after the noun, with which it is in construction,) in the sense of לפני ההיכל *in facie templi, ante templum*.*

* Though by the sense of the words in their present order the meaning is clearly limited to the Temple or Sanctuary, and therefore any alteration may be unnecessary, yet if לפני were to precede הבית so as to be connected with הוא הבית לפני i. e. *domus ipsa in facie, five domus ipsa anterior*, the language would be somewhat more explicit. The whole passage would run thus,

The ellipsis of the original is supplied in the English Version by a pronoun which refers us to the Oracle, which is mentioned in the conclusion of the preceding verse : (v. 16.) " he " even built them [twenty cubits] for it within, " even for the Oracle, even for the most Holy " place. And the house, that is, the tem- " ple before *it* [the Oracle], was forty cu- " bits long." In the Septuagint translation the ellipsis is more fully supplied by the word *δαβιρ*, or Oracle, " and the temple before *the oracle* " was forty cubits," *και τεσσαρακοντα πηχεων ην ο ναος καλα προσωπον ΤΟΥ ΔΑΒΙΡ*. The Greek translation, if literal, I conceive would have been, *και τεσσαρακοντα πηχεων ην ο οίκος, ο ναος ο εμπροσθεν*; or according to the alteration proposed in the note, *κ. τ. π. ην ο οίκος ο εμπροσθεν, ο ναος*, of which words a Glossarist or Paraphrast would have explained *εμπροσθεν* in the language of the Septuagint by *κατα προσωπον του δαβιρ*: or in the words of Josephus *προ καλαπείσματος τς αδυτς*.*

As the corrections of the Hebrew text and the translation do not appear admissible, we may now consider the grounds of the objections, which gave occasion to the pro-

וארבעים et quadraginta cubitorum erat domus ipsa anterior, templum. The appellation of *anterior* house, or something equivalent to *anterior*, was applied to the Temple, as that of *inner* house to the Oracle. Josephus calls the Temple *οίκος ΠΡΟ καταπείσματος αδυτς*. In St. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews ix. 6. it is called *πρωτη σκηνη*.

* *Ο των τεσσαρακοντα πηχων οίκος προ καταπείσματος του αδυτου.*
See above p. 16.

posed

posed corrections, "The Hebrew, (says the
 " Author,) hath nothing to determine, whether
 " the forty cubits belong to the length, the
 " height, or the breadth; neither doth it un-
 " ambiguously ascertain of what house these
 " forty cubits were the measure. (p. 98.) By
 " the manner in which it is introduced the pas-
 " sage seems to relate to the Oracle, to which
 " forty cubits are in any sense inapplicable."
 p. 102.

In the translation, which the Author gives
 of it, (p. 102.) "And forty cubits was the house
 "itself, the Temple *was* before it," it does in-
 deed seem to relate to the Oracle. But this
 direction of the sense is owing to that powerful
 term in Italics, which separates the *Temple* from
 the *House*, without any authority from the Ori-
 ginal. The very incongruity of the forty cubits
 to the Oracle is a sufficient reason for conclud-
 ing that the language of the Original does not
 relate to that part of the *vaos*; and the connec-
 tion of the verse with the preceding shews that
 it relates to the Temple, or Sanctuary. If *qua-*
draginta cubitorum erat domus ipsa, Templum
ante, which is a literal translation of the Ori-
 ginal be compared with the conclusion of the
 preceding verse, in which the *Oracle* is men-
 tioned, we are led at once to supply "templum
 " ante *id*," or "the Temple before it," as in the
 English translation, or "pro foribus *Oraculi*,"

as in the Vulgate, or καὶ ἐκ προσηγορίας τῆς Δοῦς as in the Septuagint. And thus the “domus ante Oraculum” limits the sense most unambiguously to the Temple or Sanctuary. V. 16. “He built twenty cubits — for it within, even for the Oracle, even for the most Holy place. And the House, that is, the Temple, before it, [*the Oracle*; or, and the House before it, that is, the Temple,] was forty cubits long.” The Septuagint translation is more concise, but more explicit: “And the Temple before the Oracle, was forty cubits.”

There is however nothing in the Original “to determine whether the forty cubits belong to the length, height, or breadth.” In the Latin translations of Junius, Tremellius, and Pagninus, the ellipsis is not supplied: “these translations therefore, says our Author, determine nothing. For — in what respect were these forty cubits the measure? — Even the Seventy who say, that the forty cubits were the measure of the Temple, that was before the Oracle, do not give them as the measure, in length, of that Temple.”

To this objection I answer by the following result from what has been already observed on our Author’s emendations and objections, that the number of cubits excludes them from the Oracle; and the connection of the passage confines them to the *Sanctuary*; — that they cannot belong

belong to the *front* of the Sanctuary in any sense ;—nor to the *breadth* in any sense ;—nor to the *height* ;—that they must therefore belong to the *length*. If the measure of *length* had not interfered with an Hypothesis, I think, the Author could not so far have overlooked the frequency of this Ellipsis, as to make it the occasion of a doubt in the present passage. Josephus, where he speaks of the division of the house into two parts, one (the *αδύτον*, or Holy of Holies) of twenty cubits, and the other (the *αγιος ναος*, or Holy place) of forty cubits long, (see above p. 16.) does not say *εικοσι πηχων μνηκς*, nor *τεσσαρακοντα πηχων μνηκς*, but simply *εικοσι πηχων*, and *τεσσαρακοντα πηχων*: yet in these expressions the elliptical language does not prevent their meaning being considered as *very clear and explicit* ; (see Supplement p. 94.) From this explicit testimony of Josephus there was an obvious resource : “ perhaps he was mistaken ; and undoubtedly he was, if we are to be guided by the “ Scripture account.” But in the Scripture account, which comes nearest to Josephus, “ the “ passage is so difficult and obscure, that it seems “ to be almost impossible to make any thing out “ of it with any tolerable degree of certainty.” (p. 99.) Yet admit the Ellipsis here, as it is understood in Josephus, and all will be clear. It would be easy to amass instances of this ellipsis of *μνηκος* in measures of length, if it were not sufficient

ficient to refer to a book in every body's hand, the *Ellipses Græcæ* of Bos v. *Μηκος*. The ground of the *Ellipsis* seems to be this, that of the two measures of length and breadth, where neither is expressed, the greater measure, that is, the length, is understood.

In confirmation of the opinion maintained in the preceding pages, that the Temple or Sanctuary was only forty cubits long, beside the authorities already quoted, we have the attestation of Maimonides in a passage, which will be produced below, p. 34. and of the *Middoth* ed. L'empereur, p. 163: also of Ribera de *Templi Fabrica*, p. 25. Lightfoot, p. 1064. and Lamy lib. vi. cap. 9. sect. 3.

On a review therefore of what has been advanced, it appears, by *inference* from the book of Chronicles, and *expressly* from the book of Kings, and the translation of the Septuagint, from Ezekiel, from Josephus, Maimonides, the *Middoth*, and some of the most learned Historians of the Temple, that the Sanctuary was only *forty* cubits long; and therefore, (as the Holy of Holies was *twenty* cubits,) that the *sixty* cubits mentioned in 1 Kings vi. 2. and 2 Chronicles iii. 3. as the length of *the House*, which Solomon built for the Lord, was the length of the *whole* House in the clear, and the sum of the

two

two dimensions : we may therefore further conclude (what was before assumed on more general grounds,) that the measure of the *Porch* made no part of the *clear* dimensions of the *Naos*.

§. 5. But if *sixty* cubits was the length of the whole House, that is, of the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies taken together, it will follow that these two parts of the House, were not distinct buildings, but parts of one and the same building. For there cannot be a doubt that *the House of sixty cubits*, was only one building : it is considered as one in the Supplement. *There* indeed it is asserted to be the Sanctuary. But it is impossible that it should be the Sanctuary alone, for that was only forty cubits : and if it included the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, then those two parts of the House of God must have constituted one and the same building : consequently the *vaos* of Solomon and Zerubabel were of the same length. This is a conclusion, which the Hypothesis of the *Evidence* cannot admit; the chief purpose therefore of the *Supplement* is to prove that “ the Holy of Holies was no part of that House, which it is “ said was sixty cubits in length, twenty in “ breadth, and thirty in height.” (p. 97.) The object of our Author in endeavouring to detach the Holy of Holies from the Sanctuary was to appropriate the sixty cubits to the Sanctuary :

F

but

but it appears from the preceding section, that the Sanctuary was only forty cubits long. If however any of my readers are not yet satisfied, that the Sanctuary and Holies constituted together the *same* building, the same house of sixty cubits, to them I offer the following account of the reasons proposed in the Supplement for considering them as *distinct* buildings.

1-P. 99. It is said that if the Holy of Holies were to be considered as a part of the same building with the Sanctuary, the Sanctuary could not have been forty cubits, but must have been less; for "the Holy of Holies was indisputably
 " twenty cubits in the clear, and if the wall dividing it from the other part was, as it is
 " supposed to have been, *five* cubits in thickness,
 " the Temple before the Oracle could have been
 " only thirty five cubits in length, i. e. in the
 " clear."

If there were any weight in the observation, it would make equally against the *sixty* cubits for the Sanctuary. Whether the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies be considered as separate buildings or distinct parts of the same building, it makes no difference as to the partition wall. If the wall was *five* cubits, and those five cubits must be reckoned into the Sanctuary, this deduction from the whole number would be as inconsistent with the opinion of the Sanctuary's being 60 cubits, as with the common opinion, that it was 40
 Cubits.

Cubits. But our Author brings no authority for the supposition that the wall was five cubits. The Middoth says it was only *one* cubit : *unius cubiti spatium intergerini parietis*, p. 162. The learned and researching L'Empereur in his note on this passage gives no hint of any greater space than one cubit. To the authority of the Middoth we may add that of Maimonides, who says that this wall was one cubit thick. His testimony is very particular : I give it in the words of Lightfoot. " In the Temple there was a wall, " which parted between the Holy and most Holy " place, a cubit thick. But when they builded " the second Temple, they doubted whether the " thickness of that wall belonged to the mea- " sure of the Holy place, or to the measure of " the most Holy place : therefore they made " the most holy place twenty cubits long com- " pleat. And they made the Holy place forty " cubits long compleat. And they left a space " betwixt the Holy place, and most Holy place " of a cubit breadth ; and in the second Temple " they built not a wall there, but they made " two veils, one at the end of the most Holy " place (Eastwards,) and the other at the end " of the Holy place (Westwards,) and between " them there was a cubits breadth, *according* " *to the thickness of the wall, that had been in* " *the first Temple* : but in the first Temple " there was but one veil." (*Of the Temple*, p. 1084.)

2. P. 101. " That the Oracle was no part of
 " that house (of sixty cubits,) there is a very
 " strong presumptive argument, from the fifth
 " verse (of 1 Kings vi.) if the interpretation
 " above given of the words על-פני היכל הבית
 " is a just one. For when it is said he built
 " chambers round against the walls of *the*
 " *House*, it is added, both of the Temple and
 " of the Oracle ; which it would have been su-
 " perfluous to have said, if the Oracle had been
 " a portion of and not distinct from the house
 " here described."

The common translation of על-פני היכל הבית
 is *before the Temple of the House*. Our Author
 objects to it, because " it implies as if the Tem-
 " ple was only a *portion* of the House of sixty
 " cubits, which in his opinion was not the case."
 The propriety of the Translation depends on the
 result of the present question, whether the house
 of sixty cubits included the Temple and Oracle,
 or only the Temple, and will therefore be best
 judged of at the conclusion of this Section. The
 passage in the fifth verse instead of being an ar-
 gument *against* the Temple and Oracle's being
 parts of the same building, is, in my opinion, a
 strong proof to the *contrary*, and as such will be
 adduced below, p. 43.

3. P. 103. The Author compares v. 14. in
 which it is said, " So Solomon built the House,
 " (whose length was before mentioned as sixty
 " cubits,) and finished it ;" with v. 22. which
 concludes

concludes the account of the internal structure of the House. "And the whole House he overlaid with gold, until he had finished all the House;" and from thence concludes, that the house of sixty cubits was not all the house, but a distinct building from the Oracle.

It should have been noticed by the Author that in v. 9. 10. it is said, "So he built the House and finished it, and covered the House with beams and boards of cedar. And then he built chambers against *all* the house:" not because the house was finished in *all* its parts; (for in v. 11. 12. it is said, "And the word of the Lord came to Solomon, concerning this House, which thou art *in building*, if thou wilt walk in my statutes" &c.) but because all that was finished was the *external* structure. If the two verses 10, and 22. be compared, it will appear, that both of them regard *all* the house, but in *different relations*. The verses, which precede v. 15. relate to the *external* structure of the House mentioned in v. 2. and the verses, which follow v. 14. relate to the *internal* structure and ornaments. Many of the difficulties objected to this Chapter appear to arise from not attending to these different relations.

4. A new translation of the 16th verse is given (p. 102.) in conformity to the opinion that the Oracle or Holy of Holies was a distinct building from the Sanctuary. "Moreover
" he

“ he built twenty cubits on the sides of the House, both the floor and the walls, with boards of cedar. He even built them for it within, even for the Oracle, even for the most holy place.” By some writers these twenty *cubits of cedar* are considered as relating to the partition-wall; by most, as the wainscoating and flooring, with which the inside of the Oracle was covered; but by all, except our Author, as relating to the *inside* of the building. He disposes of them very differently. Instead of “ he built twenty cubits *on* the sides of the house,” he corrects the translation thus: “ he built twenty cubits *from* the sides of the house,” that is, he says, “ he carried on the side walls of the House he had before described as built and finished, twenty cubits further.”

If the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies were together but sixty cubits, as, I think, appears from the *fourth* Section of these Remarks, these additional twenty cubits of our Author must fall to the ground. But even if the dimensions of the House would admit the sense imputed to this passage, that sense does not seem susceptible of the paraphrase, which is glossed upon it, *he carried on the side walls of the house*. To build twenty cubits *from the sides* of a building is not, I presume, to *continue the length* of a building, but to add so much to the *breadth*. In the next place the materials with which these twenty cubits were built, were boards of cedar. But
the

the structure previously described, was built with walls of *stone*: and it is not probable, that it should be continued and finished, especially the most sacred part of it, with walls of *wood*. And lastly it seems sufficiently evident from what has been said under the *third Objection*, p. 37. that the passage in question v. 16. relates intirely to the *internal* structure.

5. The difference of *materials* with which the Temple and Oracle were floored, is considered as a proof, that the Oracle made no part of the House of *sixty* cubits. (p. 103.)—The Temple was floored with fir, and the Oracle with cedar, therefore the Temple and Oracle were not parts of the same House.—It is almost needless to observe, that here is a distinction of circumstance, not a real difference. It is that sort of difference, which, the Logician says,—*facit alteratum, non alterum*. To urge the difference of flooring, to the extent of our Authors objection, has the same consequence as to say, that if the ~~Chancel~~^{Nave} of a Church be laid with stone, and the Chancel with marble, the ~~Chancel~~^{Nave} and Chancel are not parts of the same Church.

6. The difference between the *height* of the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies is urged as a decisive proof, that they were distinct buildings.
 “ If the Oracle had been a part of the House
 “ mentioned 1 Kings vi. 2. it must have been
 “ as that was, *thirty* cubits in height; whereas
 “ it

“ it is expressly said, that it was only *twenty*
 “ cubits in the height thereof.” p. 96.

This argument is repeated and urged in several parts of the Supplement (p. 95. 96. 97. 99. 103.) I think, with greater confidence than it deserves. If it were less easy to reconcile the difference of dimensions than it is, it would be more reasonable to ascribe the difficulty to the want of some information on the subject, than to place it at all in competition with the other evidence, which we possess, that the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies were parts of the same building, the same house of sixty cubits. But the difficulty is not so desperate. The following however is our Author's account of it p. 96. 97.

“ Others have conceited, that there was a false
 “ roof, in order to lower it [the Oracle] to the
 “ height only of twenty cubits. But this is all
 “ *said at random*, and without any kind of authority whatever ; and besides, is *too absurd*
 “ *to have any degree of probability*.— Solomon
 “ surely must have been a *most wretched architect*,
 “ to have erected a building thirty cubits
 “ in height, which he knew would be ten cubits
 “ higher than he had any occasion for. Is
 “ it conceivable that any man, skilful and intelligent,
 “ as was Solomon, who wanted a building twenty cubits high, should erect it
 “ thirty, *for the sake* of lowering it to the
 “ height he wanted, by means of a false roof ?

“ The

“ The *very great absurdity of this conceit* effectually destroys it. *Assuredly* therefore the Holy of Holies was no part of that House, which it is said was sixty cubits in length, twenty in breadth, and thirty in height.”

The difference of dimensions in the height of the Temple and Oracle, to allow the most of it, amounts only to the same sort of difference mentioned under the last objection : it produces a distinction of circumstance in the two parts of the House, but does not make them distinct Houses. The height of the building as mentioned in v. 2. and in the state, which it is described in from v. 4. to v. 10. inclusive, was throughout, in the clear, thirty cubits high. Two thirds of the building, that is, the whole extent of the Sanctuary, continued at its original height in the clear. But in order to give to the dimensions of the Holy of Holies, the same proportions, which it had in the Tabernacle of Moses, that is, the measure of a cube, the height, in the clear, was necessarily lowered from thirty cubits to twenty, to make it commensurate with its breadth, and length. The whole building was twice as long, and twice as wide as the Tabernacle, both in the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies; and in the latter also, twice as high. The height of the Holy of Holies was regulated by its length and breadth. But the form of the Tabernacle did not impose the same limitations on the Sanctuary as it did on the Holy of Holies: the Sanc-

tuary of the Temple therefore was three times as high as the Holy place of the Tabernacle. In the Tabernacle, which was carried before the children of Israel in their wanderings and migrations, the height was restrained by the necessity of conveyance; therefore the holy place was not higher than the most holy place: but in the Temple, which Solomon built at Jerusalem, no such necessity existing, the Sanctuary was one third higher, in the clear, than the Holy of Holies: though the whole frame of the building was of the same exterior dimensions.

I have now laid before the reader the several arguments advanced in the Supplement to prove that the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies were *not* parts of the same building: and, I think, have shewn their invalidity. To the evidence, which I have brought in opposition to those arguments, I subjoin the following additional reasons for thinking that the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies *were* parts of the same building, the same house of sixty cubits.

In the first place it appears from the separate description of the external and internal structure of the House, as above stated p. 37. that each description relates to the whole house, that is, to both the Temple and the Oracle. The description of the internal structure obviously includes both, as distinct parts in the description,
and

and as one house in the conclusion. The description of the external structure includes both also, as distinct parts, (not so distinctly, as the internal description, i. e. not by a distinction of their dimensions and ornaments, for the reason hereafter mentioned, p. 46. but yet, expressly,) and in the conclusion, as one house. In v. 5. it is said, “ And against the
 “ walls of *the House* he built Chambers round
 “ about, against the walls of *the House* round
 “ about, *both of the Temple and the Oracle.*” This passage, as was before mentioned, p. 36. is produced in the Supplement as a strong presumptive argument, that the Oracle was not a part of the same House with the Temple, but a distinct building: yet to me it seems a clear proof that the Temple and Oracle were parts of the same building. Nothing can be more manifest than that *the House* mentioned in v. 3. 4. 6. 7. &c. is one and the same with the house of sixty cubits mentioned in v. 2. It is even necessary to the Author’s hypothesis that it should be considered as the same. And it cannot be conceived that *the house* mentioned in v. 5. in the midst of this account, without any distinguishing term annexed to it, should not have the same meaning as in the subsequent and preceding verses. “ v. 1. And *the House*,
 “ which king Solomon built for the Lord, the
 “ length thereof was threescore cubits, and the
 “ breadth ~~ten~~ cubits, and the height thirty cubits.

“ 3. And the Porch before the Temple of *the*
 “ *House*, twenty cubits was the length thereof,
 “ according to the breadth of *the House*; and
 “ ten cubits was the breadth thereof, before *the*
 “ *house*. 4. And for *the House* he made windows
 “ of narrow lights. 5. And against the wall of
 “ *the House* he built chambers round about,
 “ against the walls of *the house* round about,
 “ both of the Temple, and of the Oracle: and
 “ he made chambers round about. 6. The ne-
 “ thermost chamber was five cubits broad, and
 “ the middle was six cubits broad, and the third
 “ was seven cubits broad: for without in the
 “ wall of *the House* he made narrowed rests
 “ round about, that the beams should not be
 “ fastened in the walls of *the House*. 7. And
 “ *the House*, when it was in building” &c. If
 the house in v. 5. be the same with that in
 v. 2. the Temple and Oracle become equiva-
 lent to that house, by necessity of construction:
 את-קירות הבית סבים להיכל ולהבית, *against the*
walls of the house round about, against the Temple
and against the Oracle, or as the English transla-
 tion renders it, *both of the Temple and of the Ora-*
cle. As the appellation of *the House*, though ap-
 plicable to both parts of the House, both the
 Temple and the Oracle, seems to have belonged
 peculiarly to the Temple, as *the greater house*,
 or greater part of the house, and being the
 common entrance to both parts, (just as the
 Temple, though the general term for the whole
 house,

house, belonged in a peculiar manner to the Sanctuary,) it was not, I think, "superfluous," after "the wall of the House," to add "both of the Temple and the Oracle." But, further, when it is said v. 5. that Chambers were built against the walls of *the House*, it means *the House of the Lord* mentioned in v. 2. 3. 4. When it is said, in the same verse, that Chambers were built against the walls of *the House round about*, it must mean the *whole House*, including the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies; because as the Sanctuary was not a detached building from the Holy of Holies, Chambers could not have been built round it, without including the Holy of Holies. Therefore *the House of the Lord* mentioned in v. 2. as consisting of sixty cubits in length, must have included the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies.

It should be observed likewise, that "the house" (mentioned in v. 7. which is the same with that in v. 2.) "when it was in building" "was built of stone, made ready before it was brought thither, so that there was neither hammer nor ax, nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building." It is not probable that a circumstance of so much reverence to the Deity should have been recorded of the Sanctuary only, and not of the Holy of Holies; which would be the case, if *this house* of sixty cubits had not included both the Temple and the Oracle. Indeed if the House,

House, which is described from v. 2. to v. 15. included only the Sanctuary, as our Author thinks, (p. 95. 102.) there is no account at all of the *building* of the Holy of Holies; for, as was remarked before, all the description, which follows v. 14. relates to the inside *fitting up*, ornaments, and dimensions of both parts of the House. Not to mention, that if the Holy of Holies was not included in the structure described from v. 2. to v. 14. then the Holy of Holies made no part of *the House, which King Salomon built for the Lord*: and God's promise, mentioned in v. 12. 13. was withholden from that part of the House, which he was more especially to fill with his visible presence. — There is a circumstance respecting the separate description of the *building* of the House, and the *fitting up* of the two parts of it, which, I think, deserves to be remarked, because an inattention to it seems to have misled our Author into the supposition, that the account from v. 2. v. 15. which includes the exterior building of the whole house, related only to the Sanctuary. It is this. The different degrees of sanctity in the two parts, and the different offices of religious worship required a great difference in the internal arrangements and apparatus. The two parts therefore of the House in the inside are distinguished from each other by their separate descriptions. But the exterior frame of the two parts of the house was of the same

same uniform length and height ; and therefore came under one description.

The language of 1 Kings, vi. 3. and Ezekiel may be considered as conducive to the same conclusion, that the Temple and Oracle were parts of the same building. In the book of Kings the Temple as only a part of the House of sixty cubits is called *the Temple of the House*. In Ezekiel it is said " Afterward he brought me to the TEMPLE ;—and he measured the length thereof forty cubits, and the breadth twenty cubits. Then he went INWARD,—and he measured the length thereof twenty cubits, and the breadth, twenty cubits, within the Temple." See the whole passage above p. 17. and the note. " He went from the Temple *inward* to the Holy of Holies " expresses the passage from ^{the} part of a House to another, not from one building to another. The two parts of the Naos were separated from each other by a partition of a cubit's thickness in Solomon's Temple, and in Zerubbabel's only by two veils with the same space between them. In 1 Kings vi. 27. the Oracle is called the *inner house*. Josephus applies the same term to the Oracle (τον εἰδοθῆν οἶκον) in the passage before quoted p. 16. where he says that Solomon separated the naos into two parts, or οἶκος ; the *inner house*, or the most holy place, and the *house of forty cubits*, or the holy place : he does not say he built two houses,

houses, but, he *separated* THE NAOE into two portions.

That the *Nao* of Solomon included the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies in the same house of sixty cubits, which I have endeavoured to prove from the Scriptures and Josephus, I conclude further from the following testimonies of learned inquirers into the subject, who are not accustomed to take things upon trust.

Lamy says, " Circa mensuras totius ædis, et
 " parietum ejus *nulla est difficultas*; illas liquido
 " definit Scriptura lib. 3. Regum cap. 6. v. 2.
 " *Domus autem quam ædificabat Rex Solomon*
 " *Domino, habebat sexaginta cubitos in longitudi-*
 " *ne.* Scriptor complectitur UTRAMQUE PAR-
 " TEM sanctam et sanctiorem. *Et viginti cubitos*
 " *in latitudine, et triginta cubitos in altitudine.*
 " Cum dixisset secundam partem, sive Sanctum
 " Sanctorum, habuisse viginti cubitos, adjungit
 " v. 17. *Porro quadraginta cubitorum erat ipsum*
 " *Templum pro foribus Oraculi.* In fonte no-
 " minatur הכל *bekal*, nempe pars sancta, quæ
 " erat pro foribus Sancti Sanctorum, quod et
 " Oraculum nominabatur. Nunc deest in fonte
 " דביר *Devir*: quam ibi vocem legit Hie-
 " ronymus et ante eum Græci Interpretes." *De*
 " *Tabernaculo Fœderis, de Sancta Civitate Jeru-*
 " *salem, et de Templo ejus*, lib. vi. c. ix. sect. 3.

Sir Isaac Newton says, " They went up from
 " the Priests court to the porch of the temple
 " by

“ by ten steps : and the house of the Temple
 “ was twenty cubits broad, and sixty long
 “ within ; or thirty broad, and seventy long,
 “ including the walls ; or seventy cubits broad,
 “ and ninety long, including a building of trea-
 “ sure chambers, which was twenty cubits
 “ broad on three sides of the house ; and if the
 “ porch be also included, the temple was an
 “ hundred cubits long.” *The Chronology of An-
 cient Kingdoms amended*, c. 5. §. 7.

Bedford says, “ Within the Porch there was
 “ the Body of the Temple twenty cubits broad,
 “ and sixty cubits long, including the Holy of
 “ Holies.” *The Scripture Chronology*, lib. v.
 p. 572.

I think I have now abundantly shewn that
 the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies were not dis-
 tinct buildings, but parts of one and the same
 building, the same *House of the Lord* : — that
 the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies together were
 but sixty cubits in the clear : — that the Sanc-
 tuary was but forty cubits : — that the Porch
 before the House was not included in the clear
 dimensions of the House : — that the whole in-
 terior space of the House, and of the Porch be-
 fore it, was but seventy cubits : — and that the
 whole space in length from out to out, was but
 an hundred cubits.

H

It

It is therefore evident that as the ναος of Solomon was only sixty cubits long in the clear, and Zerubbabel's was of the same length, Herod could have added nothing to the *length* of Zerubbabel's ναος to make it equal to Solomon's; and therefore that καθαιρῆσαι τὸν ναὸν, καταλῦσαι τὸ πᾶν ἔργον, &c. in the narrative of Josephus do not mean that Herod took down a *part* of the ναος to enlarge it, but that he took down the *whole*: and that ἐγερῆσαι τὸν ναὸν, κατασκευάσαι τὸν ναὸν, &c. mean that he rebuilt the Temple; and consequently that Josephus has not been misinterpreted.

POSTSCRIPT.

AT the Conclusion of the former Remarks on the Evidence, on comparing the result of the Evidence with the narrative of Josephus, though I saw not the least room to doubt of the common interpretation of the Historian, I acknowledged my apprehension of some undiscovered fallacy in my Remarks, because I saw in the *Evidence* and the *Remarks* opposite conclusions drawn from the most common points of grammatical construction. It was indeed like the unreasonable apprehension that should induce any one to doubt the evidence of his senses in attempting to prove the existence of day-light in the blaze of noon day. But the *Continuation** has taught me to dismiss these reluctant apprehensions. I do not therefore hesitate to affirm, that the *Evidence* respecting *Josephus* is defective in its principle, irregular in its premisses, and erroneous in all its conclusions. To what I have advanced in proof of this opinion in the preceding and former Remarks, I beg to add the following general remarks on the Evidence and its Continuation.

* P. 61, 62.

1. The Author takes for granted (for he certainly has not proved) that the prophecy of Haggai regards the personal appearance of the Messiah in Zerubbabel's Temple, and therefore concludes, that the Temple could never have been taken down before the coming of our Saviour.

2. He takes for granted, that consistently with that Prophecy Herod could not have taken down the Temple and rebuilt it, and therefore concludes, that Josephus in his relation of Herod's Temple at Jerusalem could not mean that he did.

3. He contends therefore, in opposition to the common grammatical meaning of such terms as *καταρῆσαι τὸν ναὸν*, *καταλῦσαι τὸ πᾶν ἔργον*, and *εὐαγγεῖον*, *εὐαγγεῖον*, *κατασκευάσαι τὸν ναὸν* &c. that Josephus does not mean that Herod took down the Temple and rebuilt it.

4. Upon the supposition that the taking down of Zerubbabel's Temple would have defeated the Prophecy of Haggai, he contends that if Josephus means that Herod took down the Temple, either Josephus was a false Historian or Haggai a false prophet, without proving the necessity of the alternative.

The source of our Author's difficulties with respect to Herod's Temple and the relative dimensions of Solomon's and Zerubbabel's Temples, seems to have been in not distinguishing the exterior from the interior dimensions of the

ναος; not the *ναος* from the *ιερον*. The former oversight seems to have given rise to his opinion that Solomon's *ναος* was forty cubits longer than Zerubbabel's, and to his Hypothesis of Herod's repairs and additions to the Temple: but the latter has extended to a greater number of particulars. I will mention some of the principal; perhaps the specification of them may contribute to the general illustration of the Inquiry.

1. Our Author thought of the *ιερον*, in which Christ was present, when he contended against the demolition of the *ναος*, in which Christ never was present, nor could be present.

2. He thought of the *ιερον* instead of the *ναος*, where he says, that if the *ναος* were only sixty cubits in length, "then the House," the "GREAT and wonderful House, which Solomon built for the God, who is GREAT above all gods," (11 Chron. 2.) will appear to have "been a bauble about ninety feet in length." *Suppl.* p. 107.

3. He applies to the *ναος*, what belongs to the *ιερον*, where he speaks of "upwards of one hundred and fourscore thousand artificers and workmen being employed for seven years together in the structure of this bauble, wonderful only on account of its littleness." *Suppl.* p. 107.

4. He thought of the *ιερον*, in the *προεδοχαι* of which the common offices of prayer, reading of the Scriptures, presentations &c. were performed,—where he considers the suspension of such offices

offices as an argument against the demolition of the *naos*, in which these offices were *not* performed. *Evidence*, p. 7.

5. He applies to the *naos* what belonged to the *ieron*, where he says that the *Porch* (ΠΥΛΩΝ) of the *naos*, the eastern part of the *House*, was the same with the ΣΤΟΑ ανατολική, which was the eastern *portico* of the *outer court* of the Temple. *Continuation* &c. p. 33.

From these παραρρηματα proceeded the following peculiarities of opinion, which are the strong holds of our Author's Evidence respecting *Josephus*, and therefore required better reasons than imperfect inferences, and better authority than gratuitous suppositions, to place them *beyond the reach of Controversy*:

1. That Solomon's *naos* was one hundred cubits long in the *clear*, which has usually been considered as only one hundred cubits from *out to out*.

2. That the Sanctuary was *sixty* cubits long, instead of forty.

3. That the Holy of Holies made no part of the *House which Solomon built for the Lord*.

4. That the twenty cubits of the *Porch* entered into the *length* of the *House*, instead of into the *breadth*.

5. That the partition-wall between the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, was *five* cubits broad, instead of one cubit.